

Remarks

Claims remaining in the present application are Claims 1-18. No new matter has been introduced.

Claim Rejections35 U.S.C §103

Claims 1-9 and 11-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bernard, U.S. Patent No. 5,497,339, hereafter referred to as Bernard, in view of Sitaraman, U.S. Patent No. 6,466,977, hereafter referred to as Sitaraman and further in view of Kimball (U.S. Patent No. 5,859,959), hereafter referred to as Kimball. The rejection is traversed for the following rational.

Bernard may purport to teach a portable apparatus for communication. However, the teachings of Bernard and the present invention are significantly different. Specifically, Bernard fails to teach or suggest a "hub/switch for detecting a connection to a portable computer system and for performing authentication in response thereto," as claimed. In fact, Bernard teaches away from the claimed embodiment of the invention because Bernard fails to describe any authentication process at all.

Claims 1 and 11 have been previously amended to include the limitation of "closing said port in response to detecting operational variations that are unfamiliar to said LAN." Applicants have reviewed the cited references and assert that Bernard in combination with Sitaraman and Kimball fails to teach or suggest this limitation. Applicants agree with the Examiner that Bernard fails to teach authenticating a user, as claimed in independent Claims 1 and 11. However, Applicants respectfully assert that Sitaraman and Kimball fail to remedy the deficiencies of Bernard. In particular, Bernard nor Sitaraman nor Kimball teach or suggest monitoring a connection for unfamiliar activity and closing a port in response to detection of unfamiliar activity, as claimed.

Sitaraman may purport to teach a scheme for authentication, however, Sitaraman fails to teach or suggest "closing said port in response to detecting operational variations that are unfamiliar to said LAN," as claimed in independent Claims 1 and 11. Applicants understand Sitaraman to teach a system for routing AAA requests to the correct proxy service based on load balancing. Sitaraman fails to teach or suggest active monitoring of the connection and a security scheme to disconnect devices that are performing actions unfamiliar to the network, as claimed.

In fact, Sitaraman merely routs the AAA requests to the correct proxy server and then is finished with the request. Sitaraman fails to monitor the connection after the request has been forwarded to another party.

Specifically, Sitaraman teaches in column 6, lines 53-57 "instead of performing standard authentication, the AAA proxy server 48 can now perform a query to its local database 50 to determine the best Telephony provider." Sitaraman fails to teach or suggest a "hub/switch is for detecting a connection to a portable computer system and for performing authentication in response thereto," as claimed.

Kimball fails to remedy the deficiencies of Sitaraman and Bernard. Kimball may purport to teach a redundant communication link, however, Kimball fails to teach or suggest "closing said port in response to detecting operational variations that are unfamiliar to said LAN," or a "hub/switch is for detecting a connection to a portable computer system and for performing authentication in response thereto," as claimed.

For this rational, Claims 1-9 and 11-17 are patentable over the combination of Bernard, Sitaraman and Kimball. As such, Applicants respectfully request allowance of these claims.

Claims 10 and 18 are rejected over Bernard-Sitaraman-Kimball in view of Atkinson (US Pat. App. No. US 2001/0054180 A1), hereafter referred to as Atkinson. The rejection is respectfully traversed for the following rational.

For the rational presented above, Bernard-Sitaraman-Kimball fails to teach or suggest "closing said port in response to detecting operational variations that are unfamiliar to said LAN," or a "hub/switch is for detecting a connection to a portable computer system and for performing authentication in response thereto," as claimed. Atkinson fails to teach or suggest these limitations. Atkinson purports to teach a system and method for synchronizing output of media in public spaces. However, Atkinson fails to teach or suggest any type of authentication at all.

In fact, Atkinson teaches away from the present invention by providing a communication link without authentication (by way of a public broadcast). Atkinson broadcast media to multiple devices at one time via multiple unauthenticated communication links. For this rational, Claims 10 and 18 are patentable over Bernard-Sitaraman-Kimball in view of Atkinson. As such, allowance of Claims 10 and 18 is earnestly solicited.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above listed remarks, reconsideration of the Claims is requested. Based on the arguments presented above, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-18 overcome the rejections and objections of record and, therefore, allowance of Claims 1-18 is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner have a question regarding the instant response, the Applicant invites the Examiner to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO L.L.P.

Dated: 9/14, 2005


Anthony Murabito
Registration No. 35,295

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060